VICE-CHANCELLOR’S REVIEW OF THE ROLE OF HALLS, RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES AND LODGES IN THE ACADEMIC LIFE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Terms of Reference

Objectives

The University is committed to a high quality and enriched educational, cultural and social experience for all its students. Halls, Residential Colleges and Lodges play a pivotal role in achieving this goal. The University now seeks to review the role of these entities with a view to implementing changes that enhance the outcomes for students.

Outcomes

The panel will review and make recommendations on:

1. The current residential environment, and its diversity, strengths and limitations;

2. Ways in which the residential experience can enhance the academic life and performance of students and complement formal academic programs;

3. How the academic role of Halls, Residential Colleges and Lodges can be enhanced so that they are recognized across the University as an essential element of its academic enterprise;

4. Initiatives which may support greater engagement of non-residential students in Halls, Residential Colleges and Lodges;

5. Initiatives which support greater cohesion of the Halls, Residential Colleges and Lodges with the Academic Colleges of the University;

6. Arrangements which best support the Halls, Residential Colleges and Lodges in attaining their outcomes, in particular

   • their governance (noting that residential Colleges are affiliates of the University);
   • appropriate leadership and management as supports their purpose, including reporting arrangements within the University;
   • consultative and deliberative processes relating to the operation of Halls, Residential Colleges and Lodges;
   • University academic and welfare services, including equity considerations; and
   • business operations, including maintenance and upkeep of facilities and other management services.

7. How the value gained by students associated with residences can be assessed - academically, socially and culturally
Review Findings

Preamble

The Panel was faced with the challenge of reviewing more than 20 substantial written submissions and attempting to follow up by interview as many of the stakeholders as possible within the space of a week. Whilst all organisational interested parties were interviewed, it was unfortunately simply not possible to meet with all individuals who had made submissions. Apart from the rather blunt instrument of the Apollo self-report survey, which only a sector of the residential students complete, the self-report survey administered by the management of the Lodges and the comparative academic performance data tabulated by University Accommodation, very little data on the student residential experience exists. There is an even greater paucity of data on the non-residential student experience. The Panel therefore had the difficult task of responding to a wide range of conflicting and strongly asserted views and opinions, little of which was able to be objectively or empirically substantiated.

Given this caveat, what follows is an attempt to synthesise the diversity of responses to the Review which the Panel believes to have all been made in good faith, and to make recommendations that specifically address the Review’s Terms of Reference.

We therefore understood this project as an exercise in ‘light touch’ developmental evaluation. There existed neither the time nor the data to provide a systematic and scientific assessment of the role of the Residences in enhancing the academic mission of the University. Nonetheless, we believe that we have been able to generate sufficient evidence to provide advice that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process.

Mark Evans and Neil Rodgers

September 2009
1. The Current Residential Environment

The first year accommodation guarantee was introduced for sound reasons but it has had serious unintended consequences of action – it has served to increase really quite significantly the numbers of excluded students from campus life (Senior University Administrator).

Introduction

The Australian National University has the admirable goal of housing 50% of its students in university accommodation. The current residential offerings on campus include University owned and operated Halls and Houses (Bruce Hall, Ursula Hall, Burton and Garran Hall, Fenner Hall, Toad Hall, Graduate House and University House), religiously affiliated Colleges (Burgmann College and John XXIII College), and BOOT scheme joint enterprises with Unilodge (Davey Lodge, Kinloch Lodge). Work has begun on the third phase of Unilodge which will be owned by the University but privately operated. This report will use the term Hall, College or Lodge when referring to a particular type of accommodation and ‘Residences’ when referring to this entire sector. The term ‘Head’ is used to refer generically to the individual charged with overseeing each residence.

The Panel found a vibrant and varied collection of student residential communities on campus that functioned well despite, in the case of the Halls, having no clear mandate and confused lines of reporting and accountability. Whilst the rich diversity of accommodation offerings is a distinct strength of the ANU residential system, diversity and effective co-operation and co-ordination are not mutually exclusive, ‘harmony without homogenisation’ being an entirely possible achievement. Lessons have been learned from the unfortunate experiences of attempting to run Davey Lodge in its first year without an adequate level of pastoral care or academic support, and under the dynamic guidance of the current General Manager both Davey and Kinloch Lodges are offering an increasing level of collegiate living combined with a degree of independence that the physical structure of the buildings afford.

Although there is a plethora of social, sporting and, to a lesser degree, cultural activity in the Residences, the variety and quality of academic programs and Learning Community activities on offer varies widely. The Residences generally do better at facilitating the personal and social ‘rounding’ of their students than they do their academic development. Although it is presently under review, the current relationship between the Academic Colleges and the Residences is at best understood as an ad hoc set of interpersonal relations and at worst, conspicuous by its absence. Moreover, the relationship between the Residences and the Directorate of Student Services is best described as lacking a sense of common purpose. Whilst the fierce ‘own-residence’ pride expressed universally by both staff and students in the Residences is testament to the success of community building, it also mitigates against these communities viewing themselves as being first and foremost an integral part of the University. Although the edges of this competitive parochialism are softening with some admirable inter-residence co-operative initiatives being undertaken by the student residents, the Heads have not so far been encouraged to realign their agendas to include supporting the University’s residential or academic mission as a whole. The Panel also found that the relationships between the Heads and the Division of University Accommodation were at best strained and at worst hostile and combative, and in urgent need of redress.
The Panel identified significant problems in the residential environment in terms of: the availability of on-campus accommodation for certain student cohorts; consistency in the quality of formal academic programs across the Residences; the coordination of professional skills training; and the reach of University governance. The character of these problems is specified below.

**Equity of Access to Campus Accommodation**

There is a significant shortage of on-campus accommodation that the University is moving to address. There is an urgent imperative to attend to the residential needs of graduate students in general and of international graduate students in particular, especially in view of the University’s stated aim of increasing its graduate student enrolment. The risk of damage to the University’s reputation by providing international graduate students with an inadequate or unhappy residential experience is very real. The First Year Guarantee, whilst being a desirable and perhaps even necessary initiative, has resulted in very few places being available to graduate students. University House, Graduate House and Toad Hall are notable exceptions and all of these Residences are significantly over-subscribed. The graduate village at Burgmann College, the modular accommodation being built at Ursula Hall and phase three of the Unilodge development can only go a fraction of the way towards meeting this need. Accommodation for graduate students with families is practically non-existent.

Graduate students wanting to live on campus have expressed a desire to live somewhat separately from the robust lifestyles of younger undergraduate students. Bruce Hall’s Packard Wing and Davey and Kinloch lodges offer potentially suitable accommodation for graduates but they are currently mostly occupied by undergraduates. There has been an assumption that graduate students can look after themselves and don’t need or desire pastoral care, social or cultural activities or professional skills development programs. If the admittedly small sample of graduate students that the Panel spoke to is representative of this population then this assumption needs to be re-examined. Many graduate students are relatively young (in their very early twenties) with many facing the challenges of the loneliness and isolation of graduate study, especially Higher Degree by Research, whilst simultaneously coping with living apart from their families, communities and cultures for the first time. It is also evident that graduate students do not desire the same type of residential support and enhancement programs as undergraduates.

The Panel found that for the most part the complex needs of Indigenous students were not addressed within the residential system. Projects such as the Burgmann College’s outreach program are encouraging recent developments. Burton and Garran Hall has begun discussing this issue with the Jabal Indigenous Higher Education Centre (JIHEC) and is in the process of establishing an Indigenous Learning Community. The Panel wishes to acknowledge and encourage these initiatives.

Another unfortunate consequence of the First Year Guarantee is that all students residing in the Canberra area are excluded from the benefits that living in a residence provides, and this poses significant issues of equity for the University. At the moment the Learning Communities offer non-residential students the most accessible opportunity of participating in some of the benefits of residential life. Other options
under consideration are those of establishing associative membership of the Residences or, more popularly, establishing one or two non-residential “virtual Halls” that would participate in inter-residence sporting and cultural activities and competitions. Consideration is also being given to establishing a physical space or amenity centre on campus that would retain students on campus between lectures, or between their last lectures and evening engagements in the Residences. If this project proceeds the Panel believes that it would contribute significantly to student engagement which in turn has been shown to be positively correlated with retention and completion rates.

**Academic Enhancement and Integration**

The nature of formal academic assistance/academic mentoring programs offered in the Residences is variable both in terms of structure and quality, and suffers in some instances from benign neglect. Although by no means unanimous, many student residents expressed the desire to see the balance between academic and non-academic activities in the Residences redressed with greater emphasis being given to academic initiatives. Apart from the blunt instrument of the self-report Apollo survey, no attempt is currently made to assess the success of the academic assistance/mentoring programs in the Residences.

Links between the Academic Colleges and the Residences are weak and where they are present consist for the most part of academic members of staff visiting the Residences to attend Commencement and Valete dinners, Faculty Nights, High Tables (Bruce Hall) and to deliver the occasional public address. The gulf between the Residences and the Academic Colleges is a wide one with many academic members of staff having very little knowledge of or interest in what takes place in the Residences. In short, the Academic Colleges do not see the Residences as being integral to the academic mission of the University. The Residences are in the process of reviving the system of appointing Academic Fellows to their communities, but the role, expectations and formal recognition of these Fellows is poorly articulated.

**Professional Skills Delivery**

There is at the moment no coordinated delivery of a suite of professional skills training, education or support into the Residences. The requests made of the various branches of the Directorate of Student Services, such as the Academic Skills and Learning Centre, Careers Centre, Counselling Centre and Health Centre tend to be ad hoc, sporadic and sometimes last-minute. Little cultural sensitivity or Indigenous issues awareness training takes place although JIHEC is well positioned to facilitate and co-ordinate such training. Nonetheless, the Residences are generally appreciative of the willing availability of the student services and of the high quality of service that they provide.
The Reach of University Governance

Both the affiliated Colleges and Unilodge (Davey and Kinloch Lodges) appear to have appropriate and functional systems of governance. The current system of having the Heads of Halls formally reporting to the Director of Facility and Services whilst reporting to the Director of the Division of University Accommodation on a daily basis is clearly dysfunctional. Several Heads expressed the view that this reporting line has inadvertently encouraged an undue focus on the operational and maintenance aspects of their roles. The relationship between the Heads and the Director of the Division of University Accommodation is very problematic. The Panel found the parties to this conflict to be dedicated professionals, each committed and working hard, in some cases passionately, to achieve what they believe their role and goals to be. However, due to a lack of role clarity, accountability, a confusion of responsibilities and a lack of any articulated system of measurable performance indicators, the parties have independently constructed roles and responsibilities that overlap, and are mutually frustrated by each other.

If the Residences are to fulfill their role of supporting and enhancing the academic mission of the University then the Heads will have to be supported to focus more specifically and actively on this aspect of their role. This in turn has implications for the internal governance structure within each Hall, with the respective duties of Heads, Deans, Sub-Deans and Hall Administrators needing to be re-examined.

There has been a sharp decline in direct student participation in decision making at both Hall and Division levels since the demise of the Halls’ Governing and Advisory bodies, resulting in a muting of the collective student voice and missed opportunities for providing students with educative leadership experiences. This is an issue that should be addressed.
2. The Academic Student Experience in the Residences

Academic mentoring and related academic programs are very much the poor cousin in the overall scheme of things. Relatively little resources are spent on them, so it is not surprising that residents of Halls and Colleges perform approximately to university averages (Residence Head).

Student wellbeing supported by pastoral care provides the best possible conditions for good academic performance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. To focus our resources for pastoral care purely on undergraduate students is a mistake (University Administrator).

The ensuing discussion of the academic student experience in the Residences is organized by student cohort – undergraduate, Masters and PhD. The Panel found significant differences in academic experiences across these cohorts. In sum, all the Residences (though with varying degrees of application and success) sought to deliver programs aimed at enhancing the educational experience of undergraduate students in the Residences, while a more limited experience was provided for Masters and postgraduate students. Unfortunately, in most cases, there was little or no attempt by the Residences to complement formal academic programs. Nor was there any evidence of the Academic Colleges seeking to use the Residences as a partner in the delivery of their academic missions. The Panel noted that this was a missed opportunity for both Academic Colleges and the Residences and policy instruments should be identified to develop joined-up thinking in this area.

The Panel asked staff and students in the Residences why non-residents tended to perform better academically than their residential counterparts. The following observations were made in response: non-residents tend to be second generation graduates from privileged Canberra backgrounds with parents from professional classes, whilst residents are often from rural Australian backgrounds living away from home for the first time. In short, the Canberra demographic is more conducive to high academic performance. This response is in keeping with the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (2009, p. 1) which states ‘Students living in residential colleges are more likely than those in the general population to be younger, in their first year of study, from a provincial area, studying full-time or an international student’. In sum, they are more vulnerable. It later notes, however, that ‘differences between residential and non-residential students’ engagement grew between first- and later-year cohorts, suggesting that the effects of college accumulate over time’ (Ibid).

The Panel also noted that the residences with the greater range of academic engagement initiatives achieved the most outstanding academic results (see Bruce Hall) while those that focused primarily on social and pastoral care performed less well.

Student Academic Engagement Initiatives

The Panel was struck by the broad range of activities through which the Residences sought to enhance the academic life and performance of its undergraduate students. These included:

- Community outreach programs.
- Debates on issues of social concern.

---

• **Faculty dinners and High Tables** to encourage intellectual debate and social interaction.

• **Learning Communities** – organised in areas such as Development Learning, Sustainability, Arts, Rhetoric and Asia-Pacific, and Music with the stated intention to ‘complement and integrate academic life with other aspects of life and learning’ providing ‘opportunities for students to apply their knowledge to ‘real-world’ projects.

• **Lecture series** sometimes including academics and alumnus.

• **Paid and unpaid academic mentoring systems** in which Year 3 students provide mentoring for Year 1 and 2 students undertaking the same degree and sometimes postgraduate students perform a similar function. It was noted that in certain instances mentoring would be provided purely on academic skills (for example, apparatus of scholarship) while in other instances pedagogical advice was given.

• **Self-regulated work groups** in which small groups of students meet on a regular basis to discuss and review their work. It was noted that this form of academic engagement required informal learning spaces within the Residences (e.g. sitting areas free from distractions) in order to function effectively.

• **Revision sessions** for particular subjects with large cohorts of students were also provided in certain Colleges.

• **Study skills programs** provided by Student Services.

• **Vice Chancellor’s Student Leadership Program**.

The Panel identified seven central findings with regard to the character and the quality of academic undergraduate engagement initiatives. Firstly, due to the absence of quality assurance processes it would be better for the academic mentoring system to focus on academic skills and to stay clear of pedagogical issues.

Secondly, the **Learning Community** approach was universally declared ‘an ANU success story’ with the exception of students from John XXXIII College and Fenner Hall who appeared to have little knowledge of the program’s existence.

Thirdly, the paucity of activities in the following areas was observed in most of the Residences: professional skills development; placement/internship activity; language learning and support. The first two sins of omission were underscored by the absence of Alumni engagement initiatives and the limited presence of the Careers Service in the residences. Although Alumni have clearly been under-utilised at the ANU (as reflected in the absence of Alumni data at the residential level) it was notable that all Colleges and Halls have begun to engage in a process of Alumni mobilisation. Although they clearly require help and support from the Centre in this endeavour, it is crucial that they play the key role in Alumni engagement as primary research on
Alumni engagement suggests that students identify with their colleges first, their faculties second and their University third.

Fourthly, we observed poor take-up of study skills support programs in the Residences partly due to poor coordination and promotion by local staff and partly due to its stigmatisation as remedial learning.

Fifthly, academic enhancement initiatives tend to have a Social Science, Law and Arts bias and do not provide particularly well for the needs of science students (with the exception of Bruce Hall) or international students.

Sixthly, and perhaps most significantly, there are significant variations in academic provision across the Residences suggesting an equity problem and the need to identify a minimum base-line of provision. Although the diversity of approaches to enhancing the academic experience within the Residences is to be celebrated, it does raise issues of equity across the student body. Moreover, none of the Residences, with the exception of Burgmann College, possess a statement which outlines the educational mission within the residence and the role of its academic programs in meeting its mission. The whole system of academic support would be made clearer through developing a broader conception of ‘the Learning Community’. The notion should not purely focus on issues of social learning but should also encompass other areas of personal development such as study skills, professional skills, community outreach, language learning and support.

With regard to postgraduate academic engagement activities, the Panel also found significant variations in academic provision across the Residences. We observed an extremely tense situation at Toad Hall where Hall staff displayed a sense of fatalism about their capacity to engage its large community of international students in the academic life of the residence. This was reflected in claims that do not square with international experience; that international Masters students are not interested in engaging in residential life and just want to focus on getting through their studies. Although attempts were being made to deliver various academic and social activities such as induction programs, speaker series, international nights and a Learning Community Approach was being explored, the community was featured by a profound sense of fragmentation and isolation. There is a clear need for: greater pastoral care (although applied with cultural sensitivity); primary support systems such as language support, proof reading and academic mentoring; greater inclusion of students in decision-making processes and culturally nuanced social and academic activities. In sum, Toad Hall requires community-driven academic development that reflects the needs of the community. It should also be noted that PARSA is conspicuous by its absence in Toad Hall and given its large numbers of students drawn from the Crawford School the development of a strong working relationship between the two bodies would be mutually beneficial.

The academic experience at Graduate House and University House is of a very different character in the sense that residents benefit from a range of academic activities such as weekly dinners devised to encourage intellectual and social interaction and a monthly lecture series. The Panel was surprised, however, given the wonderful facilities available, that the Academic Colleges had made little effort to integrate University House and Graduate House into the academic enterprise. Graduate House and University House have immense potential as a ‘horizontal
meeting place for the University’; a depoliticised space for interdisciplinary research training, seminars, workshops and conferences and professional development. How easy it would be to engage scholars and alumni in the academic enterprise in Graduate House and University House with these facilities at their disposal!

Data clearly demonstrate that postgraduate students, in particular international postgraduate students are an extremely vulnerable group – often away from home, their families and their culture for the first time, many struggling with English as a second language and simultaneously learning a new disciplinary language. Moreover, many research students (depending on their program) often suffer from significant social exclusion due to the emphasis on independent research and the absence of coursework. Coursework ‘routinises’ the working day and ensures greater social interaction and by implication opportunities for personal problem-solving. These are profound challenges which require effective support systems. It should be noted that Toad Hall is presently host to many future leaders of foreign governments studying with the support of AUSAID scholarships and the potential risk to the University’s reputation of an unhappy residential experience cannot be understated. While Toad Hall, University House and Graduate House have invested in pastoral care, the Review Panel considered this may not be sufficient to meet the high level of need of this target group.

In sum, both pastoral care and academic activities in the Residences are essential policy instruments for ensuring social cohesion and enhancing the reputation of the University at home and abroad.

Recommendations

1. The Residences should include a statement in their student handbook outlining the educational mission within the residence and the role of its academic programs in meeting its mission.
2. The funding of the position of a part-time Learning Community Co-ordinator should be continued.
3. Funding should also be provided for Learning Community programs.
4. All the Residences should deploy a Learning Community approach and minimally provide the following Learning Community Programs:
   - An integrated Study Skills Program delivered by Student Services.
   - A Professional Skills Program delivered in collaboration with both the Careers Service and through engaging alumni in program management and delivery.
   - A Community-outreach Program to help foster communal solidarity and University-Community relations.
   - A Language Learning and Support Program to provide students with the opportunity to learn a second language and to enhance the language skills of non-English speakers.
   - A Social Learning Program (e.g. Sustainable Development).
5. Learning Community Programs should be carefully planned and staggered through the academic year to ensure a good work-life balance and maximise student participation.
6. Good attendance and engagement with the Learning Community Programs could be rewarded on graduation with an ANU Vice-Chancellor’s Award to encourage broad participation.

7. Pastoral care should be provided in the postgraduate residences. Funding for this provision could be found from existing resources. A ‘needs-based’ pastoral care system delivered through the provision of office hours and helplines can help to target need more effectively and allow for a more equitable distribution of resources across the Residences.

8. The Review conducted of Toad Hall at the end of 2008 should be re-visited with the aim of providing the Hall with: a) an effective system of internal governance; b) cultural sensitive pastoral support; and, c) community-driven academic development programs. Most importantly, Toad Hall needs a Head with delegated authority.
3. **Enhancing the Role of the Residences in the Academic Enterprise**

A focus on academic performance requires nothing less than academic leadership (Head of Residence).

It would be awesome if we had more contact with academics in the College (2nd Year Undergraduate college student).

We have what can best be described as a distant relationship with the Academic community (Head of Residence).

It would be best to fan the fire of the embers of cooperation that already exist rather than impose a cooperative regime on unwilling partners (College Dean).

The Panel identified five interesting findings in this area of evaluation. Firstly, there is a clear desire by students for Academic Colleges to play a greater role in delivering academic programs in the Residences. Second, the Academic Colleges do not currently share this enthusiasm as the Residences are not considered part of the academic community due to the absence of ‘academic’ leadership. Third, there is a perception within parts of the ANU community that many of the Residences suffer from low academic esteem and confidence due to the absence of ‘academic’ leadership. Where it does exist within the leadership of the College either at the level of Head or Dean there is a palpable difference in terms of both the academic esteem and the confidence of the residence (see Burgmann, Bruce and Ursula). Fourth, most academic staff do not see any incentive to participate in academic programs in the Residences. Unfortunately, a ‘publish or perish’ philosophy has become the dominant ideology of the aspirant academic class and this is viewed as the key to the ANU’s spectacular rise in the University World league tables. Indeed, those academics who do engage tend to be drawn from the professorial class. As one academic observed, ‘they’ve made it; so they have the time to participate’. Fifth, the most successful area of academic participation in the educational life of the Residences currently lies through participation in Learning Community Programs.

These five observations suggest that enhancing the role of the Residences in the academic enterprise will require: a) strong academic leadership in the Residences; b) the provision of institutional incentives for Academic Colleges to participate; c) the provision of individual incentives for academics to participate; d) a clearly defined role in the academic enterprise; and e) the pro-active support of the Vice-Chancellor and his senior colleagues.

**Recommendations**

9. Recruit academic leaders with strong scholastic credentials to manage and deliver academic programs within the Residences.

10. Encourage academic participation through, for example, changing the promotion criteria so that advancement to Associate Professor level is determined by making a ‘more than significant’ contribution to three out of four areas – research, academic community building, administration and teaching and learning.

---

2 As these recommendations impact on issues of Leadership and Governance please also refer to Section 6 ‘Recommendations’ to understand the broader institutional logic of reform.
11. Establish Vice-Chancellor’s Fellowships in the Residences both to help deliver academic programs and to join-up residential and Academic College missions.

12. Explore the possibility of providing credit weighting for the ANU Vice-Chancellor’s Award to free-up Academic workload for research purposes.
4. Non-Residents and the Residences

It probably isn’t fair that we have all these extra forms of support but there again they have the support of their families and friends (3rd Year Undergraduate college student).

An ANU experience must involve engagement with a Hall or College or it isn’t an ANU experience (Hall Alumnus)

The ‘townees’ don’t understand the Colleges (1st Year Undergraduate college student).

The University is the college for local students isn’t it? (1st Year Undergraduate college student).

The disparity between the educational opportunities and experience offered to residential and non-residential students constitutes a significant equity issue for the University. This issue is exacerbated by the accommodation shortage which results in many students not being able to choose a residential experience. This is particularly true of Graduate students.

There is currently no data on what non-residential students actually want. At present the Learning Community Programs (LCPs) offer the most accessible bridge between non-residential students and a collegiate residential experience as many of the activities organized by the LCPs take place in the Residences. Indications are that between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of students attending LCP events are non-residents. The LCPs also provide a valuable forum for inter-disciplinary study and are another means of connecting the Residences to the Academic Colleges. They also facilitate interaction between the residents from the various residential Colleges, Halls and Lodges. The Panel endorses and strongly supports the continued activities of the LCPs as a key instrument for non-residential student engagement.

Burton and Garran Hall and the College of Science are experimenting with using specifically reconfigured and equipped space within a Hall to deliver some of the CoS’s formal teaching programs. This trial should be closely monitored. Conducting limited formal teaching from the Residences may help bridge both the divide between residential and non-residential students and the divide between the Residences and the Academic Colleges.

Recommendations

13. Learning Community Programs should be more actively promoted to non-residential students.
14. Consideration should be given to constructing a central facility to retain non-residential students on campus between lectures and between lectures and evening activities in the Halls, and to serve as a base for potential Virtual Halls.
15. ANUSA and PARSA should be invited to investigate the feasibility of forming one or more Virtual Halls for non-residential students.
16. Non-residential students should be surveyed to ascertain their needs especially with regard to the residential experience.
17. Further delivery of academic programs in the Residences with appropriate teaching facilities should be explored.
5. Inter-residence Coordination

Inter-collegiality could easily be improved through the provision of joint social events aimed at particular sub-communities such as international students.

Perhaps the most surprising finding of this evaluation was the discovery that there was what can best be described as limited, mostly ad hoc forms of inter-residential collaboration occurring at the University. Collaborative governance of this form is crucial for harnessing the creative energies of staff and students in the Residences, pooling shared resources and achieving economies of scale in areas of common concern and presenting a united voice in defence and promotion of the College system. The Residences should be a proactive voice at the forefront of the modernisation process. They should be setting the agenda rather than having the agenda set for them. At the very least they should forward and defend a common vision of the role of the Residences in delivering the academic mission of the University. Current governance structures do not foster collaborative behaviours. Indeed the absence of cooperative institutional structures facilitates a war of all against all in which the preservation of parochial interests takes precedence over collective goods.

Recommendations³

18. Cooperative institutional structures should be established at the inter-organisational level to ensure the delivery of collective goods.
19. Inter-residential initiatives should be created such as a Residences Fund aimed at pooling resources to combat social exclusion, for example, through the provision of joint social events aimed at particular sub-communities such as indigenous Australians, international students and their families or non-residents.
20. Inter-residential lesson-drawing forums should be established to share good practice in social, pastoral and academic programming across the Residences.

³ As these recommendations also impact on issues of Governance please also refer to Section 6 ‘Recommendations’ to understand the broader institutional logic of reform.
6. Leadership and Governance

There is a real tension between an obsession with fixtures and fittings and realising the VC’s aspiration of Halls and Colleges being centres of learning (University Administrator).

The governance of the independent residential Colleges and Lodges would appear to be appropriate with their Heads expressing satisfaction with current arrangements. The leadership, governance and management of the Halls needs to be significantly revised to better support these residences in achieving their outcomes in general and a closer alignment with the University’s academic mission in particular. More specifically:

Leadership

The nature of the academic leadership provided in the Halls varies widely with some Heads and Deans having PhDs or other graduate qualifications, others having undergraduate degrees and yet others having certificates and diplomas. It is very difficult for a Head who does not have a graduate degree to lead with credibility an aspiring academic community. Whilst recognising and endorsing the diversity of residential communities at the University, the Panel considers it essential that either the Head or the Dean of each Hall (preferably both), hold graduate qualifications, preferably PhDs.

The Panel also considers it highly desirable for each Head to hold a fractional appointment in one of the Academic Colleges, or at the very least to contribute to an Academic College’s teaching or research program in some way. This would serve to boost the academic standing of the Head’s leadership and to bridge the divide between the Academic Colleges and the Residences.

The use of the term ‘Dean’ in both the Academic Colleges and the Residences has led to some confusion. The Panel also found significant overlap between the academic support and pastoral care roles of the Heads and residential Deans, although the current reporting lines to Facility and Services have encouraged Heads to focus on the operational aspects of their Halls. To redress this imbalance the Panel recommends that the current position of residential Dean be replaced with that of Vice-Chancellor’s Fellow, having a 0.5 appointment in the Hall and a 0.5 appointment in an Academic College. It is recommended that this appointment be at approximately academic level B6/C1. To attract the appropriate caliber of staff, this appointment should be seen as competitive and prestigious and therefore be included in the criteria for promotion. Such an arrangement is intended to encourage Heads to refocus their attention on building community, academic support, pastoral care, and in general, better integrating their Halls with the University’s academic mission. The Heads, whilst maintaining a watch over the operational aspects of their Halls, would delegate this authority to the Hall Administrators whose increased level of responsibility would be recognised by having their position reclassified to ANU Officer 8.
Governance

As has already been mentioned, the Panel considers the current reporting lines of the Heads to Facilities and Services to be inappropriate. The new governance structure for the Halls needs to be able to resolve tensions between a conceptualization of the Halls as diverse and different communities and the University’s desire for a co-coordinated response to its accommodation needs. The Panel believes that a harmonized and more thoroughly considered response to the academic, personal and professional needs of all the University’s students, both residential and non-residential, can also be achieved without detracting from the individual nature of each Hall.

There is a clear need for a coordinated response to the Halls’ collective operational needs such as accounting, Human Resources, conference trade and maintenance/refurbishment. Few Heads have expertise in these areas, many of which have specific and detailed reporting and compliance requirements. Significant cost savings and long term planning benefits would also be achieved through having such a coordinated response structure. However, the current term ‘University Accommodation Division’ (used more in conversation than in formal documentation) perhaps implies too broad a mandate and the Panel recommends that this term be replaced with a simple ‘University Accommodation’.

Organisational Chart 1. Governance ‘Preferred’ Option

1 PVC Student Welfare and Development to have responsibility for the welfare and development of residential and non-residential students; PVC chairs Committee for Student Welfare & Development. The PVC position to be partially funded through $200,000 saved by converting Dean’s position to .5 VC Fellowships to embed and provide gravitas to academic mission.
There is a need to develop and deliver a more thoroughly considered, comprehensive and coordinated program of academic support, pastoral care and professional skills development into the Residences. The current head of the Directorate of Student Services is the Deputy Registrar (Student Services), who reports to the Registrar. The Registrar’s Division is, however, primarily an administrative unit, and the Panel considers a more appropriate and educational line of reporting to be to the PVC Student Welfare and Development (see below). It would therefore be appropriate to designate the head of these services as the Director of Student Services. Such a response would also help address the personal and professional development needs of both residential and non-residential students in a more integrated and holistic manner.

The role of the Dean of Students is an integrative one; that office having a mandate that encompasses issues of student welfare and academic matters for all students, residential and non-residential, undergraduate and graduate. The Panel therefore recommends that this officer also report to the PVC Student Welfare and Development and furthermore that she/he be a member of the Committee for Student Development.

The Panel recommends that a new senior position be established to oversee all aspects of the University’s residential and student welfare and development mandate. Ideally this position would be at Pro Vice-Chancellor level (PVC Student Welfare and Development), and this position would chair a consultative Committee for Student Development (see Organisational Chart 1 – Preferred Governance Option). Should the cost of establishing the optimal arrangement prove to be an unsurpassable impediment, then the Panel recommends that a new position of Dean of Student Development (SAO 4 or Academic level E) be established to coordinate these functions, with direct report to the current PVC Education (see Organisational Chart 2).

Direct reports to the PVC Student Welfare and Development (or the Dean of Student Development) would include the Heads of Halls, the Director of University Accommodation (previously called Director of the Division of University Accommodation), the Director of Student Services (previously Deputy Registrar, Student Services), the Dean of Students and the Coordinator of Learning Communities. As noted in Section 5, it is also recommended that the Heads of the residential Colleges and the General Manager of the Lodges also be invited to participate in the meetings of the Committee for Student Development.

There has been a marked decline in the level of student participation in decision making since the demise of the Halls’ Governing and Advisory Bodies. The Panel recommends that each Hall re-establish an Advisory Committee, and that these Committees be chaired by an Alumnus of the Hall. In addition to the Head, Vice-Chancellor’s Fellow and Hall Administrator who would all hold ex officio membership, it is envisaged that the President of the residents’ association, a Senior Residential Scholar and a representative of the Hall’s Academic Fellows also be members. Consideration could also be given to each Hall inviting a Head of another Hall to membership of the Committee as a means of encouraging and enabling a broader perspective.
Recommendations

21. In the future, all individuals appointed to the position of Head should have graduate qualifications, preferably a PhD.

22. Wherever possible, the Head should hold a fractional appointment in an Academic College.

23. The position of residential Dean should be replaced with that of Vice-Chancellor’s Fellow, holding a 0.5 appointment in the Hall and a 0.5 appointment in an Academic College. It is further recommended that the first of these positions be introduced at Ursula Hall to assist with the support of the increased student population that the new modular accommodation will bring.

24. The position of Hall Administrator should be upgraded to ANU 8 reflecting the level of responsibility this officer holds for directly overseeing the financial and operational matters of each Hall.

25. Each Hall should establish an Advisory Committee that includes direct student, academic and alumni participation.
26. A new senior position (either PVC Student Welfare and Development or Dean of Student Development) should be established to oversee and coordinate all aspects of the University’s residential and student welfare and development mandate.

27. The post-holder should be responsible for convening and chairing a Committee of Student Development comprised of the Heads of Hall, the Director of University Accommodation, the Director of Student Services, the Dean of Students and the Coordinator of Learning Communities. It is also recommended that the Heads of the residential Colleges and the General Manager of the Lodges also be invited to attend and participate (see Appendix 1).
7. **Measuring the Academic Value of the Residential Experience**

The following criteria serve as guidelines for the construction of effective performance indicators for measuring the academic value of the student experience.

1. Indicators should measure change in specifically those conditions that the residential experience is attempting to improve.

2. The measurement of progress must relate closely to the aims agreed upon; hence, the importance in this instance, of establishing a clear statement of academic purpose across the Residences.

3. It follows from items 1 and 2 that the process of selecting indicators should be a participatory one in which all stakeholders and a representative sample of students should be involved.

4. All indicators selected must be simple, knowable by all (i.e. by all stakeholders and students) and easy to monitor.

5. They should be precisely specified and capable of accurate measurement in quantitative or qualitative terms.

6. Data relating to them must be available, or capable of being produced.

7. Movement up and down the value of any indicator should have an unambiguous positive or negative meaning in relation to the intentions of the Residential experience.

8. The movement should, so far as possible, reflect changes brought about by the activities initiated within the Residences rather than changes stemming from other University interventions.

9. The information produced on some indicators may have a ‘downside risk’ in the sense that it may feed negative perceptions and prejudices and must therefore be carefully managed.

10. Given the range of objectives that the Residences are attempting to achieve, in the selection process there should be a clear understanding of the difference between ‘structure’, ‘process’ and ‘outcome’ indicators and of the usefulness of certain proxy indicators in some circumstances.

‘Structure’ (S) indicators refer to formal, written or legal structures. ‘Process’ (P) indicators refer to working practices and norms. ‘Outcome’ (O) indicators measure the outcomes of the program.

It is important to keep S, P and O indicators separate because it may well be that despite the rules (S), the ‘process’ (P) may not implement the rules very well, nor may the ‘outcome’ (O) reflect their apparent intention. As Peter Ambrose (2005, p. 49) puts it:
The three types of indicator can be understood by analogy with making a pudding. The $S$ is the recipe, the $P$ is the making of the pudding and the $O$ is the eating. Proverbially, the proof of the matter lies in the $O$, not in the other two.\footnote{Ambrose, P. (2005), ‘Urban regeneration: who defines the indicators?’ In D. Taylor and S. Balloch, eds., The Politics of Evaluation: Participation and Policy Implementation, London, Policy Press.}

However, in the case of enhancing the academic experience in the Residences, $P$ is also vitally important because of the broad range of stakeholders who carry out academic development functions (e.g. in the case of Colleges, the College Head, Deans, College Tutors, Academic Mentors, Student Services etc.). In short, policy is made and remade in the process of implementation.

It is beyond the scope of this review to specify such indicators in detail. Indeed, as guideline 3 notes this would not be legitimate as this should be the task of key stakeholders and a representative sample of students. Suffice to say that as these performance indicators will provide the basis for subsequent monitoring and evaluation, they must be kept under regular review and amended whenever the academic ‘goals’ are changed.

**Recommendations**

28. It is recommended that the new PVC Welfare and Student Development appoint a working party including key stakeholders, a representative sample of students, Liam Cosgrave (who has volunteered his services) and CEDAM, to develop a set of measurable performance indicators to assess the academic, social and cultural value gained by students. We would also suggest that once developed these performance indicators could be used to partially assess Head's performance. It should also be noted that Unilodge has already developed an impressive range of indicators pertaining to the quality of the residential experience in all areas of potential enquiry with the exception of the academic enterprise.
Appendix 1. Illustrative Terms of Reference for the Student Welfare and Development Committee

Please note that these terms of reference are deployed at the University of York for policy development and operational delivery matters pertaining to student welfare and development. They would therefore need to be carefully assimilated into the ANU governance structure if found to be a useful point of reference.

Terms of reference

PURPOSE

The central purpose of the Student Welfare and Development (SWDC) Committee is to provide a forum where the various elements of the ‘student experience’ – outside specific learning objectives of the programmes – are addressed. The Committee reports primarily to Senate and to the Policy & Resources Committee of Council on matters which carry financial implications. It is designed to help to integrate a range of support services and act as a champion for such provision within the University.

The Committee is a strategic body, informing priorities and setting the strategic framework for student service provision. Student representatives are members of the Committee but, in line with University practice, cannot vote on issues with significant financial implications, including the setting of rents. The Chair SWD will decide which issues fall into this category.

Areas where the Committee's role is to inform or shape policy or strategy

1. To agree strategic plans and policies in respect of the non-academic student experience. The aim is to ensure that services are presented to all students in an integrated way and are of the highest quality, within the resources available. Such strategic plans and policies include:

• Accommodation, on and off campus
• Alcohol and drugs
• Careers, including personal development planning (joint with Teaching Committee)
• Childcare
• Residential bars and social facilities
• The Residential system
• Counselling service for students
• Disability support
• Faith and religion
• Financial support, information and advice
• Health provision, physical and mental
• Immigration advice
• International student support
• Sport
• Student catering
• Learning Community Programs
• Welfare advice

2. To identify the needs of specific groups of students (e.g., overseas, part-time, mature, visiting and disabled students, ethnic minority students and students with families).

3. To liaise with the Board for Graduate Schools in developing specific plans for postgraduate students.

4. To co-ordinate (1), (2) and (3) with strategic plans for Teaching and Learning, Research, the Physical Environment, and other relevant Corporate Plan objectives.

5. To approve action plans arising out of the strategic plans agreed in (1).

Areas where the Committee's role is to decide

6. To consider recommendations concerning the annual rents for University-owned accommodation, to determine these, in consultation with the Director of Finance or his representative, and report them to the SMG.

7. To take decisions, especially in the light of (1), (2), (3) and (4) above and (8) below, on other strategic issues affecting the student experience, as these arise, and to incorporate these decisions, where relevant, into action plans.

Areas where the Committee's role is to make recommendations

8. To agree, in the light of the University's financial requirements and in consultation with relevant budget holders, the annual priorities relating to services provided for all students arising from the action plans, and to recommend these through its Chair to the SMG as part of the budget-setting process.

9. To identify discrete areas of activity which are significant to the non-academic student experience but which can be sustained only by subsidy or by forgoing income generation, and make recommendations to the SMG.
Areas where the Committee's role is to monitor

10. To monitor the performance and efficiency of student services against their strategies and to receive annual reports from them.

11. To keep under review the provision for needs of specific groups of students identified in (2).

General

12. To facilitate co-operation between the student services provided by the University and those provided by York University Students' Union and the Graduate Students' Association.

13. To consider ways of promoting equal opportunities and diversity in relation to all the above.

STANDING SUB-COMMITTEES

1. Immigration Advisory Sub-Committee
2. Mental Health Group
3. Quiet Place Group
4. Rents Group
5. Student Services Consultative Sub-Committee.

STUDENT SUPPORT FORUM

A meeting is held once a term of those involved in face-to-face student support, chaired by the PVC for Students, to discuss issues of common concern.

Those invited to attend will include:

- Academic Registrar
- One representative of Accommodation Office
- One representative of Counselling Service
- The Coordinator of the Learning Community Program
- One representative of Disability Services
- One representative of Student Financial Support Unit
- One Chaplain
- Provosts
- EO Adviser
- International Student Support Coordinator
- One Student Welfare Adviser
SU Academic and Welfare Officer
SU Academic and Welfare Coordinator
GSA Welfare Officer
One representative of University medical advisers
Secretary, Student Support and Special Cases Committees

(Agendas and notes: Manager, Student Support Office)

STUDENT SERVICES CONSULTATIVE SUB-COMMITTEE
(a standing sub-committee of Student Services Committee)

Membership

a) (Chair of Council)
b) (Lay Member of SSC))
c) Head, Campus Services
d) Director, Commercial Services
e) Manager, Student Support Services
f) 2 Heads of Hall
g) Student Union (SU) President
h) SU Academic and Welfare Officer
i) SU Services and Finance Officer
j) Graduate Students Association (GSA) President
k) GSA Welfare Officer
l) 3 Residence Association Chairs - in rotation
n) One Academic College Student representative from each of:
   • Sciences
   • Social Sciences
   • Arts & Humanities

Secretary – Manager, Student Support Office
Terms of Reference

1. To provide a consultative forum for matters within the remit of Student Welfare and Development.

2. To receive reports from the Catering Consultative Group and the Bars Strategy Group.

3. To consider specific matters referred by Student Services Committee.

4. To raise matters of general interest to the student body and refer them appropriately.
Appendix 2. Written submissions to the Review

PROFILE SUBMISSIONS

NAME
Burton & Garran Hall
University Accommodation
Toad Hall
Ursula Hall
Fenner Hall
University and Graduate House
John XXIII
Bruce Hall
Burgmann College
Unilodge (Davey and Kinloch Lodge)

SUBMISSIONS

NAME
Mr. John Croker
Mr. Keith Conley
Ms. Marie Wensing
Ms. Melissa Hayes
Mr. Selwyn Cornish
Ms. Annie Bartlett
Dr. Michael Shortland
Dr. George Watt
Ms. Heather McLeod
Prof. John Richards
Mr. Warwick Williams
Mr. Peter Fyfe
Mr. Liam Cosgrave
Mr. Greg Lopez
Mr. Andrew Fernie
Ms. Kate Gemmell
Mr. Sean Brito-Babapulle
Ms. Marion Stanton
Dr. Dierdre Pearce
Ms. Jacki-Lyn Arnold